Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Confirmation No. 7941

Application No.:	10/676,744
Filing Date:	September 30, 2003
Appellants:	Harold N. Rosenstock et al.
Group Art Unit:	2155
Examiner:	David R. Lazaro
Title:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR LIMITING STANDBY SUBNET MANAGERS
Attorney Docket:	1400B-000028/US

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Sir:

This is an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from a final decision of Examiner Lazaro mailed February 5, 2008 and Advisory Action mailed July 23, 2008 wherein Claims 1-42 were finally rejected. A Notice of Appeal was timely filed in the Patent and Trademark Office on August 4, 2008.

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest in this matter is Emerson Network Power - Embedded Computing, Inc., having a place of business at 8310 Excelsior Drive Madison, Wisconsin 53717.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellants direct the Board's attention to U.S. Application No. 10/676,746, currently under appeal, which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application and are appealed herein.

IV. Status of Amendments

Pursuant to the Advisory Action dated July 23, 2008, Appellants' Amendment submitted on July 3, 2008 was not entered by the Examiner.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The present application is directed to a method and system for managing INFINIBAND architecture subnet. See, e.g., Application, pg. 4, lines 1-5.

INFINIBAND architecture is an interconnect technology for interconnecting a plurality of nodes to form a system area network. See, e.g., Application, pg. 4, lines 1-5. The INFINIBAND architecture specification sets forth the standards by which INFINIBAND architectures may interconnect. The INFINIBAND architecture specification fails to provide a standard for failover and database replication, leaving it to the various manufacturers of INFINIBAND architecture hardware and software systems to provide such functions. See, e.g., Application, pg. 4, lines 1-5.

An INFINIBAND architecture subnet includes a plurality of nodes (102) that are interconnected with bi-directional links. See, e.g., Application, pg. 4, lines 6-14 and Fig. 1. At least one these nodes includes a subnet manager that manages the routing and various other functions within the subnet. Id. In the claimed embodiment, a subnet manager is provided at each node of a plurality of nodes within the subnet. One subnet manager will include the master subnet manager function (206), a subset of the others will be standby subnet managers (210), and

the remaining subnet managers will be made inactive. See, e.g., Application, pg. 8, lines 10-27 and Figs. 1-2. The disclosure is directed to a method and system for selecting the set of standby subnet managers based on a priority value and globally unique identifier of each node.

Each of the plurality of nodes in the INFINIBAND architecture will be assigned a priority value and a globally unique identifier. See, e.g., Application, pg. 7, lines 12-23. The priority values can be determined in various ways, and may be made to reflect the relative importance or lack of importance of a particular node in the subnet. See, e.g., Id. The globally unique identifier may be in an identifier or address that is unique to a particular node both within the subnet in which the node is resident as well as any other subnets connected through the subnet of interest through, e.g., a router. The priority value and global unique identifier for each node may permit the ranking of each of the plurality of nodes by, e.g., a ranking algorithm. See, e.g., Application, pg. 7, line 24 to pg. 8, line 9. Furthermore, the priority value and global unique identifier of each node further allows the determination of a set of standby subnet managers from the larger set of nodes. The subnet managers that are neither the master subnet manager or within the set of standby subnet managers are rendered inactive. See, e.g., Application, pg. 8, lines 10-27.

Appellants respectfully submit the following tables as a further summary of the claimed subject matter. The tables below include the following information: (i) a verbatim listing of each limitation of the independent claims on appeal, (ii) an identification in the drawings of an example of each limitation as illustrated in the drawings, and (iii) an identification by page and paragraph number in the disclosure of a portion of the specification that discloses each limitation.

Claim Language	Example in Drawings	Exemplary Reference in Specification
1. A method, comprising: providing an INFINIBAND architecture subnet having a plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes has a priority value and a globally unique identifier;	"plurality of nodes" - FIG. 1, element 102	pg. 4, lines 6-22
	"priority value" - FIG. 3, element 324	pg. 7, lines 12-23
	"globally unique identifier" -	pg. 7, lines 12-23

Claim Language	Example in Drawings	Exemplary Reference in Specification
	FIG. 3, element 326	
providing a subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes;	"subnet manager" - FIG. 3, elements 305 and 306	pg. 7, lines 12-14
ranking each of the plurality of nodes according to the priority value and the globally unique identifier; and	FIG. 3, element 311	pg. 7, line 24 to pg. 8, line 9
selecting if the subnet manager is included in a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes.	"set of standby subnet managers" - FIG. 3, element 328	pg. 8, lines 10-27

Claim Language	Example in Drawings	Exemplary Reference in Specification
15. An INFINIBAND architecture subnet, comprising:		
a plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes has a priority value and a globally unique identifier;	"plurality of nodes" - FIG. 1, element 102	pg. 4, lines 6-22
	"priority value" - FIG. 3, element 324	pg. 7, lines 12-23
	"globally unique identifier" - FIG. 3, element 326	pg. 7, lines 12-23
a set of standby subnet managers; and	"set of standby subnet" - FIG. 3, element 328	pg. 8, lines 10-27
a subnet manager included within each of the plurality of nodes, wherein the plurality of	"subnet manager" - FIG. 3, elements 305 and 306	pg. 7, lines 12-14

Claim Language	Example in Drawings	Exemplary Reference in Specification
nodes are ranked according to the priority value and the globally unique identifier, and wherein the subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes is selected to be included in the set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes.	"ranked" according to priority value and globally unique identifier" - FIG. 3, element 311	pg. 7, line 24 to pg. 8, line 9

Claim Language	Example in Drawings	Exemplary Reference in Specification
29. An INFINIBAND architecture node comprising a computer-readable medium containing computer instructions for instructing a processor to perform a method of limiting a set of standby subnet managers, the instructions comprising:	"set of standby subnet managers" - FIG. 3, element 328	pg. 8, lines 10-27
providing an InfiniBand architecture subnet having a plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes has a priority value and a globally unique identifier;	"plurality of nodes" - FIG. 1, element 102	pg. 4, lines 6-22
	"priority value" - FIG. 3, element 324	pg. 7, lines 12-23
	"globally unique identifier" - FIG. 3, element 326	pg. 7, lines 12-23
providing a subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes;	"subnet manager" - FIG. 3, element 311	pg. 7, lines 12-14
ranking each of the plurality of nodes according to the priority value and the globally unique	FIG. 3, element 311	pg. 7, line 24 to pg. 8, line 9

Claim Language	Example in Drawings	Exemplary Reference in Specification
identifier ; and		
selecting if the subnet manager is included in the set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes.	"set of standby subnet managers" - FIG. 3, element 328	pg. 8, lines 10-27

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The following issues are presented in this appeal:

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 29-31, 34-37 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier et al. (US 6,941,350; hereinafter "Frazier") in view of InfiniBand Architecture Specification Volume 1 Release 1.1 published November 6, 2002 and provided through Appellants' IDS submitted 09/30/2003 (hereinafter "IBA Specification").

Claims 4, 5, 10, 14, 32, 33, 38 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of IBA Specification and in further view of Rooney (US 6,519,660; hereinafter "Rooney").

Claims 15-17, 20-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier.

Claims 18, 19, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of Rooney.

VII. Argument

A. <u>The Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 29-31, 34-37 and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of IBA Specification).</u>

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 29-31, 34-37 and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of IBA Specification. Appellants

respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 29 are allowable over Frazier in view of IBA Specification for the reasons discussed below. For these same reasons, Claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-13, 30-31, 34-37 and 39-41 should also be allowable.

1. Frazier fails to teach selecting a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifiers of the nodes.

Claims 1 and 29 are directed to a method that includes selecting if the subnet manager is included in a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes. In other words, these claims are directed to selecting which subnet manager(s) of all possible subnet managers will be included in the set of standby subnet managers, based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the nodes.

Frazier fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Frazier, at best, appears to disclose determining which of a set of subnet managers has the highest priority and making that subnet manager the active subnet manager. This differs substantially from forming a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes. Appellants can find no mention in Frazier of selecting a set of standby subnet managers from all possible subnet managers based on the priority value and globally unique identifier of each node as claimed.

The Office Action mailed February 5, 2008 states that Frazier teaches "providing each of the plurality of nodes with a subnet manger (Col. 8 lines 38-44)." Appellants have reviewed this section in detail and respectfully submits that the cited section of Frazier has been misconstrued by the Examiner. This section, at best, discloses communication between a subnet manager and subnet management agents in each node. This is not the same as providing each of the plurality of nodes with a subnet manager. Further, the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008 states that Frazier teaches "selecting if the subnet manager is included in a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes (Col. 10 lines 20-38 and Col. 11 lines 49-64: selection can use both priority and GUID)." Appellants have reviewed these sections in detail and respectfully submits that these sections, at best, address negotiation between subnet managers as to which of the subnet mangers will become the master subnet manager. These sections do not teach or suggest selecting if the

subnet manager is included in a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes as claimed.

2. Frazier fails to teach providing a subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes in a subnet.

Appellants agree with the Examiner that Frazier does not explicitly disclose providing a subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes of the subset. See, pp. 10-11 of the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008. Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Frazier's suggestion of having multiple subnet managers implies including one for each of the plurality of nodes in the subnet as claimed. Frazier teaches away from including a subnet manager in each of the plurality of nodes. The Frazier reference repeatedly discusses the "hundreds or thousands" of nodes that may be present in its disclosed SAN network. See, e.g., column 2, lines 1-3 and column 10, lines 13-15. Including "hundreds or thousands" of subnet managers in the complex negotiation that determines which acts as master, as described by Frazier, is impractical. Furthermore, Frazier explicitly teaches that including "too many" standby managers is undesirable. See, column 12, lines 19-20. Therefore, Frazier teaches away from providing a subnet manger for each of "hundreds or thousands" of nodes in a network, as provided for by the claims.

B. The Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 10, 14, 32, 33, 38 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of IBA Specification and in further view of Rooney.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 5, 10, 14, 32, 33, 38 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of IBA Specification and in further view of Rooney.

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 4, 5, 10 and 14, and Claims 32, 33, 38 and 42 relies upon the rejection of Claims 1 and 29, respectively, combined with the Rooney reference. Appellants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 29 distinguish over Frazier and IBA Specification, as discussed above, and also submit that Claims 4, 5, 10, 14, 32, 33, 38 and 42, which depend from Claims 1 and 29, distinguish over the Frazier/IBA Specification/Rooney combination for the same reasons.

C. The Rejection of Claims 15-17, 20-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 15-17, 20-23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier.

Claim 15 is directed to an INFINIBAND architecture subnet that includes (1) a subnet manager within each of a plurality of nodes, and (2) a set of standby subnet managers in which a subnet manager within each of the nodes may be included by a selection based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of the node. These limitations correspond to the limitations described in regard to Claims 1 and 29 above. For the same reasons that Claims 1 and 29 are allowable, Appellants respectfully submit that Claim 15, as well as Claims 16-17, 20-23 and 25-27 which depend therefrom, are also allowable.

D. The Rejection of Claims 18, 19, 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of Rooney.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 18, 19, 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frazier in view of Rooney.

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 18, 19, 24 and 28 relies upon the rejection of Claim 15 combined with the Rooney reference. Appellants respectfully submit that Claim 15 distinguishes over Frazier, as discussed above, and also submit that Claims 18, 19, 24 and 28, which depend from Claim 15, distinguish over the Frazier/Rooney combination for the same reasons.

E. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Appellants respectfully request that the Board direct the Examiner in charge of this examination to withdraw the rejections.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this appeal to Deposit Account 08-0750.

VIII. Claims Appendix

A copy of the claims involved in this appeal, namely Claims 1-42 is attached as a Claims Appendix.

IX. Evidence Appendix

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 6, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166
Michael A. Schaldenbrand, Reg. No. 47,923

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
Attorney for Appellants

JML/MAS/gmp

VIII. Claims Appendix

1. A method, comprising:

providing an INFINIBAND architecture subnet having a plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes has a priority value and a globally unique identifier;

providing a subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes;

ranking each of the plurality of nodes according to the priority value and the globally unique identifier; and

selecting if the subnet manager is included in a set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein selecting comprises selecting if the subnet manager is included in the set of standby subnet managers up to a limit value.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a highest priority value to a lowest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a lowest globally unique identifier to a highest globally unique identifier.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each

of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of priority values.

5. The method of claim 3, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of globally unique identifiers.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a lowest priority value to a highest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a highest globally unique identifier to a lowest globally unique identifier.

7. The method of claim 6, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of priority values.

8. The method of claim 6, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of globally unique identifiers.

9. The method of claim 1, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a highest priority value to a lowest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node,

further ranking the first node and the second node from a highest globally unique identifier to a lowest globally unique identifier.

10. The method of claim 9, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of priority values.

11. The method of claim 9, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of globally unique identifiers.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a lowest priority value to a highest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a lowest globally unique identifier to a highest globally unique identifier.

13. The method of claim 12, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of priority values.

14. The method of claim 12, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of globally unique identifiers.

15. An INFINIBAND architecture subnet, comprising:

a plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes has a priority value and a globally unique identifier;

a set of standby subnet managers; and

a subnet manager included within each of the plurality of nodes, wherein the plurality of nodes are ranked according to the priority value and the globally unique identifier , and wherein the subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes is selected to be included in the set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes.

16. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 15, wherein the subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes is selected to be included in the set of standby subnet managers up to a limit value.

17. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 15, wherein the plurality of nodes comprise a first node and a second node, wherein each of the plurality of nodes is ranked from a highest priority value to a lowest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for the first node is identical to the priority value of the second node, the first node and the second node are further ranked from a lowest globally unique identifier to a highest globally unique identifier.

18. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 17, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of priority values.

19. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 17, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of globally unique identifiers.

20. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 15, wherein the plurality of nodes comprise a first node and a second node, wherein each of the plurality of nodes is ranked from a lowest priority value to a highest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for the first node is identical to the priority value of the second node, the first node and the second node are further ranked from a highest globally unique identifier to a lowest globally unique identifier.

21. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 20, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of priority values.

22. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 20, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of globally unique identifiers.

23. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 15, wherein the plurality of nodes comprise a first node and a second node, wherein each of the plurality of nodes is ranked from a highest priority value to a lowest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for the first

node is identical to the priority value of the second node, the first node and the second node are further ranked from a highest globally unique identifier to a lowest globally unique identifier.

24. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 23, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of priority values.

25. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 23, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of globally unique identifiers.

26. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 15, wherein the plurality of nodes comprise a first node and a second node, wherein each of the plurality of nodes is ranked from a lowest priority value to a highest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for the first node is identical to the priority value of the second node, the first node and the second node are further ranked from a lowest globally unique identifier to a highest globally unique identifier.

27. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 26, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of priority values.

28. The INFINIBAND architecture subnet of claim 26, wherein the subnet manager is selected from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of globally unique identifiers.

29. An INFINIBAND architecture node comprising a computer-readable medium containing computer instructions for instructing a processor to perform a method of limiting a set of standby subnet managers, the instructions comprising:

providing an InfiniBand architecture subnet having a plurality of nodes, wherein each of the plurality of nodes has a priority value and a globally unique identifier;

providing a subnet manager within each of the plurality of nodes;

ranking each of the plurality of nodes according to the priority value and the globally unique identifier ; and

selecting if the subnet manager is included in the set of standby subnet managers based on the priority value and the globally unique identifier of each of the plurality of nodes.

30. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 29, wherein selecting comprises selecting if the subnet manager is included in the set of standby subnet managers up to a limit value.

31. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 29, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a highest priority value to a lowest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a lowest globally unique identifier to a highest globally unique identifier.

32. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 31, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of priority values.

33. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 31, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of globally unique identifiers.

34. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 29, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a lowest priority value to a highest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a highest globally unique identifier to a lowest globally unique identifier.

35. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 34, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of priority values.

36. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 34, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of globally unique identifiers.

37. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 29, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a highest priority value to a lowest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a highest globally unique identifier to a lowest globally unique identifier.

38. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 37, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of priority values.

39. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 37, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a highest set of globally unique identifiers.

40. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 29, wherein ranking each of the plurality of nodes comprises ranking each of the plurality of nodes from a lowest priority value to a highest priority value, and wherein if the priority value for a first node is identical to the priority value of a second node, further ranking the first node and the second node from a lowest globally unique identifier to a highest globally unique identifier.

41. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 40, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of priority values.

42. The INFINIBAND architecture node of claim 40, wherein selecting comprises selecting the subnet manager to be included in the set of standby subnet managers by selecting the subnet manager from each of the plurality of nodes with a lowest set of globally unique identifiers.

IX. Evidence Appendix

None.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.

G:\jlafata\1400B - Emerson - Embedded Computing\000028-US\Appeal Brief\Appeal Brief.doc